

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

GEORGE A. HENDERSON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Civil Action 2:05-cv-359  
Judge Frost  
Magistrate Judge King

OHIO ADULT PAROLE AUTHORITY,  
*et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER AND  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Having conducted the initial screen of the complaint required by 28 U.S.C. §§1915(e), 1915A, it is **RECOMMENDED** that the claims asserted against the Ohio Adult Parole Authority, an agency of the State of Ohio, be **DISMISSED**. See *Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781 (1978). At this juncture, however, the claims asserted against the named individual defendants may proceed.

The United States Marshal is **DIRECTED** to effect service of process on the individual defendants, who shall have forty-five (45) days from the date of service to respond.

If any party seeks review by the District Judge of this *Report and Recommendation*, that party may, within ten (10) days, file and serve on all parties objections to the *Report and Recommendation*, specifically designating this *Report and Recommendation*, and the part thereof in question, as well as the basis for objection thereto. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1); F.R. Civ. P. 72(b). Response to objections must be filed within ten (10) days after being served with a copy thereof. F.R. Civ.

P. 72(b) .

The parties are specifically advised that failure to object to the *Report and Recommendation* will result in a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the District Judge and of the right to appeal the decision of the District Court adopting the *Report and Recommendation*. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Smith v. Detroit Federation of Teachers, Local 231 etc.*, 829 F.2d 1370 (6th Cir. 1987); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

April 7, 2005

s/Norah McCann King  
Norah M°Cann King  
United States Magistrate Judge